

U.S.  
THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
BULLETIN

VOLUME II • Numbers 28-53

January 6-June 29, 1940



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1940

---

111

RC.

# THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

JANUARY 6, 1940

*Vol. II: No. 28—Publication 1422*

## *Contents*

EUROPE:	
Protest to Great Britain on treatment of United States mails . . . . .	Page 3
British search of United States ships . . . . .	4
British blockade of German exports . . . . .	5
GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY PROJECT . . .	5
THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS:	
The 1930's—A Decade of Progress in Inter-American Relations: Address by Ellis O. Briggs . . . . .	6
Haiti: Anniversary of independence . . . . .	10
THE NEAR EAST:	
Earthquake in Turkey . . . . .	10
COMMERCIAL POLICY:	
Trade-agreement negotiations with Argentina . . . .	10
GENERAL:	
Outlook for the coming year: Statement by the Secretary of State . . . . .	11
TRAFFIC IN ARMS, TIN-PLATE SCRAP, ETC.:	
Exportation of tin-plate scrap . . . . .	12
PUBLICATIONS . . . . .	12
FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES:	
Personnel changes . . . . .	13

[Over]



TREATY INFORMATION:

Navigation:

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway Project . . . 14

Telecommunications:

North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement . 14

Health:

Arrangement for the Establishment of the International Office of Public Health (Treaty Series No. 511) . . . . . 15

## Europe

### PROTEST TO GREAT BRITAIN ON TREATMENT OF UNITED STATES MAILS

[Released to the press January 21]

Upon instructions of the Secretary of State, the American Embassy at London has delivered to the British Foreign Office a note reading textually as follows:

"The United States Department of State has been advised that British authorities have removed from British ships and from American and other neutral ships American mails addressed to neutral countries and have opened and censored sealed letter mail sent from this country.

"The following cases among others have come to the Department of State's attention: On October 10 the British authorities took from the steamship *Black Gull* 293 sacks of American mail addressed to Rotterdam and ten sacks addressed to Antwerp. On October 12 authorities in the Downs removed from the *Zaandam* 77 sacks of parcel post, 33 sacks of registered mail, and 156 sacks of ordinary mail addressed to the Netherlands, as well as 65 sacks of ordinary mail addressed to Belgium, four to Luxemburg, three to Danzig and 259 to Germany. On October 12 authorities at Weymouth removed from the *Black Tern* 94 sacks of American mail addressed to Rotterdam, 81 to Antwerp and 184 to Germany. On October 24 authorities at Kirkwall removed from the *Astrid-Thorden* 468 bags mail from New York to Gothenburg and 18 bags from New York to Helsinki. Many individual instances of British censorship of American mails have come to the Department's attention.

"This Government readily admits the right of the British Government to censor private mails originating in or destined to the United Kingdom or private mails which normally pass *through* the United Kingdom for transmission to their final destination. It cannot admit the right of the British authorities to interfere with American mails on American or other neutral ships on the high seas nor can it admit the right of the British Government to censor mail on ships which have involuntarily entered British ports.

"The eleventh Hague Convention recognizes that postal correspondence of neutrals or belligerents is inviolable on the high seas. The United States Government believes also that the same rule obtains regarding such correspondence on ships which have been required by British authorities to put into a British port. This view is substantiated by Article 1 of the Convention which stipulates: 'If the ship is detained, the correspondence is forwarded by the captor with the least possible delay.' The United States Government regards as particularly objectionable the practice of taking mails from vessels which ply directly between American and neutral European ports and which through some form of duress are induced to call at designated British control bases. This is believed to be a clear violation of the immunity provided by the Hague Convention.

"The United States Government feels compelled to make a vigorous protest against the practices outlined above and to express the hope that it will receive early assurances that they are being discontinued."

## BRITISH SEARCH OF UNITED STATES SHIPS

[Released to the press January 5]

Following is the text of a note from the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, to His Excellency, the Marquess of Lothian, the British Ambassador, December 14, 1939:

**"EXCELLENCY:**

"I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's note, no. 471, of November 9, 1939, in regard to certain provisions of the Neutrality Act of 1939 and to the President's Proclamation of November 4, issued pursuant to the terms of Section 3 of that act, in which you inform me that your Government feels obliged formally to reserve its rights in the matter of the exercise of belligerent activities in respect to United States vessels in the manner indicated in your note of September 10, 1939.

"It was suggested in that note that neutral vessels en route to certain countries should voluntarily call at one of the several 'contraband control' bases designated by your Government in order that the examination of their cargoes might be facilitated, by examination in port rather than on the high seas. Since, pursuant to the Act of Congress approved November 4, 1939, and the President's Proclamation of the same date, it becomes illegal for American vessels to enter the so-called combat zone about the British Isles and the Northern coast of Europe, they are thereby precluded from voluntarily entering the 'contraband control' bases within the combat zone, and Your Excellency's note is understood as undertaking to reserve a right of your Government to divert American vessels to such bases, by force if necessary, acting, in that respect, without regard to the municipal law of the United States or the rights, obligations, and liabilities of American vessels under that law.

"In this connection I am impelled to bring to the attention of Your Excellency's Government the following considerations which I conceive to be of such importance as to merit most careful notice.

*"First.* Since, under the Neutrality Act, it is illegal for American vessels to carry cargo to belligerent ports in Europe and Northern Africa, such vessels will, of necessity, be carrying only such cargo as is shipped from one neutral country to another. Such cargo is entitled to the presumption of innocent character, in the absence of substantial evidence justifying a suspicion to the contrary.

*"Second.* It is my understanding that the American steamship companies operating vessels to European destinations, putting aside certain of their rights under accepted principles of international law, have voluntarily indicated a willingness to cooperate with the British authorities in every practicable manner intended best to serve the mutual interests of themselves and the British Government in those circumstances in which the respective rights of the two parties might be regarded by them as in some respects in conflict. It is my belief that such a spirit of liberality on the part of American shipping interests should be met by a corresponding degree of accommodation and flexibility on the part of the British Government, and that such mutual deferences should avoid giving rise to any occasion for the forcible diversion of such American vessels to those belligerent ports which they are by the law of the United States prohibited from entering.

"In view of these considerations, it is difficult for my Government to foresee, as a practical matter, any occasion necessitating the entry of American vessels into belligerent ports. If, despite these considerations the British authorities should feel it necessary to compel any American vessel to enter the combat area or any of those belligerent ports which by the provisions of the neutrality law they are prohibited from entering, the Government of the United States will feel it necessary to examine carefully into all of the facts of the case and to take such further action as the results of such examination appear to make necessary or expedi-

ent. Meanwhile, I feel that I should inform Your Excellency that this Government, for itself and its nationals, reserves all its and their rights in the matter and that it will be expected that compensation for losses and injuries resulting from the infraction of such rights will be made as a matter of course.

"Accept [etc.]

CORDELL HULL"

♦ ♦ ♦

### BRITISH BLOCKADE OF GERMAN EXPORTS

[Released to the press January 4]

The following is a list of questions which were submitted by the American Embassy at London to the British Ministry of Economic Warfare concerning the matter of interference by British authorities with shipments of commodities purchased in Germany. The following answers to each of these specific questions are in the form stated by the Ministry of Economic Warfare in an official communication to the American Embassy dated December 25, 1939:

*Q. First.* What measures are in effect or in contemplation in the direction of assurances, before shipment from German and neutral ports, of noninterference with such consignments?

*A.* Applications for exemption from the provisions of the order in council in certain circumstances will be entertained and if granted an assurance will be given that the consignment concerned will not be interfered with.

*Q. Second.* Under what circumstances and on the basis of what evidence will such assurances be given?

*A.* Such exemptions will only be given in very exceptional circumstances. It is not possible to define the facts on which an exception may be made because, as you will appreciate, this will depend on the particular circumstances of each case. When, however, any application for exemption is made the fullest possible information should be supplied, including in particular

all details of the shipment desired, together with the names and addresses of consignor and consignee, the origin of the goods, the contract under which they were purchased, dates on which payment therefor is due, and the dates on which any payments therefor have been made.

*Q. Third.* To whom should such evidence be presented, and, generally speaking, what periods of time are likely to follow presentation of such evidence before decisions will be rendered respecting individual shipments?

*A.* All such applications should be addressed to the Ministry of Economic Warfare with any further documentary evidence that is available. It is not necessary to state how long a period of time is likely to elapse before decisions will be made in regard to individual shipments, but every effort will be made in this Department to minimize delay.

*Q. Fourth.* What is the nature of and what value will be given to such advance assurances?

*A.* The nature of any assurance given, in cases where an exemption is granted, will be a communication to that effect made to the applicant. In such cases the necessary instructions will be given to all the naval and customs authorities concerned.

The above is released merely for the information of the public. The United States has protested the legality of the British order in council of November 28, 1939, by a note dated December 8, 1939, delivered by the American Embassy in London to the British Foreign Office and made public on December 8, 1939.

---

### GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY PROJECT

An announcement to the press regarding the proposed general treaty with Canada dealing with the utilization of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin appears in this *Bulletin* under the heading "Treaty Information."

## *The American Republics*

### THE 1930'S—A DECADE OF PROGRESS IN INTER-AMERICAN RELATIONS

Address by Ellis O. Briggs<sup>1</sup>

[Released to the press January 4]

An examination of inter-American relations in 1939 is of interest chiefly in the light it casts toward the future. As members of the Advertising Club and as business executives, it may be that you have already speculated on the influence of the dry pages of yesterday's events on the customs and habits of tomorrow, knowing that these will govern the acceptance or rejection of tomorrow's products and standards. In international affairs, likewise, such speculation is more than the satisfaction of curiosity, since a correct interpretation of recent history is essential to an understanding of today and tomorrow. Nor is it easy, for the tempo of a generation ago has been accelerated, and the river of history now moves at freshet speed, wherein events, like leaves in the flood, swirl below the surface almost before they can be identified. The banks of such a stream do not always provide sure footing for an historian.

Although the students of 1950 will benefit from a perspective now lacking, we are warranted in drawing certain general conclusions, based not alone on 1939 but on the decade just ended. The 1930's witnessed a very notable development—and a very notable improvement—in the relations of the 21 American republics among themselves. The 1930's witnessed the solution of a number of difficult specific problems and the development of others, solution of which has yet to be found. But of greater moment than these concrete credits and debits, the 1930's witnessed the beginning of an era of good feeling among the American peoples—an era in which we are today and whose duration,

we profoundly hope, extends far beyond the present horizon. In these difficult times, in which so much that we cherish is either jeopardized or impaired, it is encouraging to consider how substantial have become the foundations of that era. We have quarried for those foundations in the political field, in the economic field, and in the field of human relations.

In the political field the decade saw in the New World the acceptance of the doctrine of nonintervention: a renunciation, if you will, of an occasionally asserted right the allegation of which—not only by our Government but also from time to time by other countries of the hemisphere—had been largely responsible for deferring the establishment of a genuine solidarity of outlook and purpose among the American republics. Wholehearted acceptance of this principle by the United States was inherent in the announcement and definition of the "good neighbor" policy in 1933. It was ratified by all of the American republics before the end of that year through the adoption at the Montevideo Conference of a convention providing that no state has the right to intervene in the affairs of any other state. And the sincerity of our own ratification of this doctrine of juridical equality was demonstrated through our abrogation in 1934 of the Platt Amendment, under which for a generation we had maintained the right to intervene in the affairs of Cuba.

War visited the American republics in the last decade, and six nations cooperated in the negotiation of a peace which delimited boundaries in the Chaco—boundaries in dispute for over a century but now accepted by Bolivia and Paraguay in satisfaction and in good faith. The achievement of that peace represented a practical example of conciliation and disinter-

<sup>1</sup> Delivered before the Advertising Club of New York City, January 4, 1940. Mr. Briggs is Acting Chief of the Division of the American Republics, Department of State.

ested cooperation of which the New World is justly proud. It is an achievement which encourages us to believe that the remaining boundary problems, legacies of the inadequate geography of the colonial period now fortunately few in number, are susceptible of early and peaceful adjustment.

The threat of war, elsewhere in the world, was of increasing preoccupation to this hemisphere as the decade advanced. In surveying the achievements of the American republics against the disquieting back drop of the present conflagration, I believe we are entitled to recognize with satisfaction that as early as 1936 the will to peace of the American republics devised practical machinery to make that will effective. The establishment at Buenos Aires of a procedure of consultation whereby, within 3 weeks of the outbreak of hostilities last September, the representatives of 21 nations were able to meet in Panamá and there within a few days unanimously to determine upon measures to safeguard themselves, is one of the outstanding achievements—not of the last decade—but of the long development of inter-American relations.

Before undertaking to comment on the Declaration of Panamá, which advanced last October the proposition that the neutral American republics are entitled as a measure of continental self-protection to have those waters adjacent to the American Continent, which we regard as of primary concern and direct utility in our relations, free from the commission of hostile acts by the belligerents, I should like to ask that you imagine that the recent naval engagement off the coast of Uruguay had instead taken place off the southern shore of Long Island. Let us suppose that the merchant vessel overhauled by the battleship *Graf Spee* had been en route from Boston to New York, instead of from Brazil to the River Plate, and let us suppose that the running battle that followed took place from Montauk Point to Sandy Hook, with gunfire audible throughout the day to all the intervening towns on Long Island. Let us suppose further that after a brief period of refuge in New York harbor, the *Graf Spee* was then

blown up near Staten Island, with an explosion that rattled the windows in lower Manhattan.

The picture is not overdrawn; I merely recount, in terms of local geography, what occurred off Uruguay between the thirteenth and seventeenth of last month. Should we then have regarded that picture with complacency?

The Declaration of Panamá sets forth that the family of American nations, neutrals in the present conflict, separated from the belligerent countries by thousands of miles and a broad ocean, are entitled—and by right of self-protection entitled—not to have the war brought to the neighborhood of the New World.

The Declaration must be viewed in terms of an evaluation of the collective rights of the neutral nations of an entire hemisphere, when confronted with a conflict absorbing the energies of three of the principal nations of another continent. The indiscriminate laying of mines in the North Sea, the seizure of exports consigned by one of the belligerents to neutrals, and interference with the mails are recent examples of the degree to which an individual nonbelligerent may rely on what international conventions tell him about his neutral rights in time of war. One of the most important factors leading to the increase in the number of participants in the war 25 years ago was the throttling of neutral trade, accompanied by a progressive trampling by belligerents upon neutral rights.

The criticism has been made that the Declaration will not be enforced, the inference apparently being that force may be required, and that unless force is brought to bear the doctrine is merely a limp scarecrow, to be knocked flat by the first gust of wind, and then to be forgotten.

That is a short view and one which overlooks both the vitality of the present inter-American relationship and the direction of the growth of that relationship. Such evolution is necessarily gradual, as an examination of the development of the concept of continental solidarity will disclose, but it is nonetheless increasingly powerful and effective. Consider by way of illustration the contrast between the divergent views of the American neutrals that ex-

isted 25 years ago and the views prevailing among the American republics today. The test of time, measured in longer units than weeks, is necessary to gauge the effectiveness of the doctrine expressed in the Panamá Declaration. Let it be remembered that our relationship is not a static association and that the machinery of consultation is in more useful operation today than ever before, that through daily exchanges of views the governments concerned are trying to determine at each stage the most practical steps to take in furtherance of their common aims. And let it be written as significant that the Declaration interprets the will of the people of 21 neutral countries to preserve this continent—our continent and theirs—for peace.

In the economic field the decade of the 1930's represented a period of trade and financial dislocation and of efforts to adjust the life of the Americas to social as well as to economic change. The achievements in the economic field were not so striking nor so readily defined as those that took place in the field of inter-American political relations. It was perhaps a period of development and of progress toward achievement, rather than of achievement itself.

An important exception was in the realm of transportation, since the decade saw not only a great improvement in steamship services among the Americas but saw also the coming of age of international aviation. For people in the United States, with the easy accessibility of every part of the country through our network of railroads and highways, the airplane was a logical and natural development. It is not easy for us to visualize the transformation wrought by aviation in the lives of countries that still await land-travel facilities comparable to our own. During a century and a half, ours was a gradual transition—from pony express, to stagecoach, to railroad, to automobile—and then to the airplane. But for many of the areas to the south the change was from muleback to the airplane—not in a century but in a single decade. There are towns in South America today, hundreds of miles from the nearest

railroad and without a single automobile, towns whose roofs and plazas echo daily with the hum of the airplane engine.

The problems resulting from tariff nationalism have been recognized, and there has been a general realization of the direction in which we must move to find relief. Substantial progress has been made toward opening the channels of trade, at the same time that the mechanics of international trade have not grown simpler but have become—with quotas, controlled exchange rates, and blocked balances—more complex.

The problem of external debts, which the 1930's inherited from the preceding decade, has attained only partial solution. Until that situation is finally settled, on terms satisfactory alike to debtor and creditor, it constitutes an obstacle to development.

There is the problem of direct investments abroad and their relationship to governments and to the structure of society in the other American republics. No one will successfully deny the importance of the contribution of many of these enterprises toward material well-being and in promoting the development of natural resources. Today a number of our sister republics are in urgent need of additional capital, the reluctance of which to move abroad—although understandable in terms of certain recent experiences—is nevertheless causing a deferment of the satisfaction of their legitimate needs. And yet, until mutually equitable ways have been found for integrating some of these enterprises within the local economic patterns, and for adjusting them to the changed and changing requirements of society, it seems possible that private capital may continue to remain aloof, like Achilles in his tent, potentially strong but currently unadventurous.

When one remembers the commercial dislocation caused by the outbreak of European hostilities in 1914, it is heartening to realize how much less serious was the immediate impact of war a quarter of a century later. This was so, not because the economic armor of the individual American republics had become in the inter-

val less vulnerable, but because whereas in 1914 each of the 21 nations stood alone, in 1939 they stood together.

After 4 months of warfare in Europe it is of course not yet clear what the ultimate economic effects of the conflict on the American republics will be. The initial effect of the removal of Central Europe as a source of supply and of uncertain shipping facilities from Western Europe was a considerable shifting of urgent orders to the United States and a postponement of other orders pending a clarification of the outlook. At the present time each country presents a separate picture depending on the types of products which it offers for export and on its former reliance on Central European markets. Since it appears that the western belligerents are unlikely to facilitate the transfer to dollars of the proceeds of exports to them from the other American republics, we may expect to maintain and to increase United States exports to the other American republics only if we ourselves are able to make dollar exchange available, by imports from them, by tourist travel, or otherwise.

At the Panamá meeting, to which I have already referred, the American republics created a Financial and Economic Advisory Committee composed of one representative from each country. The Committee began its work on November 15 and will remain in continuous session. Its general purpose is to further the development of healthy economic life in the Americas, and although it would be premature to predict what types of joint action the Committee may from time to time recommend, much useful preliminary work has already been accomplished. In considering the direction of future economic collaboration, it should be noted that the process of consultation now invoked has not been limited to mitigating the effects of the war. The cooperative actions born of the emergency are in addition including the study of long-range economic problems, quite aside from those resulting from hostilities. There is a new emphasis upon the necessity of the prosperous development of our neighbors to the south if

healthy inter-American trade relations are to obtain. Not only must the channels of trade be kept open, but merchandise must flow in each direction.

Finally, there is the field of human relationships, a less tangible area than those of international policy and economics, but perhaps the most important field of all. It may seem strange in future years that this was the last to engage our attention and that in the New World an awareness of each other—not as governments, but as individual people—developed so slowly.

The cordiality of governments is important and desirable. But no matter how genuine that cordiality may be, and no matter how warm may appear from official messages to be the esteem of a government leader in one country for the chief of state of another, that cordiality is a superficial and transient phenomenon unless it is founded on the understanding of peoples and on their genuine liking and respect for each other. In a world in which governments exist to serve and not to dominate or to impose—in a world in which the dignity of the individual is maintained—in short, in our American world—it is the human relationship that constitutes the first and the essential ingredient in international friendship.

It is especially encouraging therefore to record that the decade of the 1930's saw such substantial progress in the field of human relations. Today, there has already developed in the American republics a sound reciprocal appreciation of literature, music and painting, of our indigenous art, and of the opulent treasures of our joint colonial heritage. Today, more young men and women than ever before are studying the languages spoken by our neighbors to the south; similarly, more students and teachers from Mexico, Middle and South America, and the Caribbean are coming north to visit our people and to learn our way of life. These are developments of the utmost importance to all the Americas.

In one respect, however, this interchange has not yet fulfilled its possibilities. People know

each other not by reading, motion pictures, or radio—which are after all merely valuable adjuncts to understanding—but by meeting one another and by establishing personal associations, as individuals. And thus far, relatively few citizens of the United States have visited the southlands. The present would seem to be a particularly propitious time for us to enjoy their friendly hospitality. Transportation facilities are available. The sea lanes of the New World are open, and we have expressed our determination to maintain them. Superior accommodations by air and land and water are at our disposal. Passport requirements have not, as they have for travel to various other parts of the world, been rendered more complicated or difficult. Why then do we hesitate? Is it merely that we have failed to take into account that in the last 4 months not a single American citizen traveling between ports of the American republics, on vessels of any of their flags, has been subject to delay or inconvenience because of conditions relating to the conflict in Europe?

The role of governments in promoting friendly individual relations among people is necessarily limited. We have no "official culture" to sell to any of our neighbors. The idea, in fact, of an official culture is repugnant to us, and it would be equally repugnant to them. In the field of human association the role of a government is to encourage, to cooperate, and to coordinate private initiative and the initiative of institutions seeking to broaden the base of cultural appreciation. These it seems to me are useful and legitimate functions of governments truly representative of the peoples who compose them.

In the three areas of political relations, of economic relations, and of human relations the decade of the 1930's witnessed important advances. The background of peace, trade, and cultural interchange has given to us, individuals in the great family of 250,000,000 citizens of the American republics, a larger stake than ever before in the maintenance in the years to come of this, our inter-American era of good feeling.

## HAITI: ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

[Released to the press January 2]

Following is the text of a message from the President to the President of Haiti (Sténio Vincent):

"JANUARY 1, 1940.

"Upon this anniversary of the independence of Haiti it is with pleasure that I extend to Your Excellency my most sincere felicitations and earnest good wishes for the happiness of the Haitian people.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT"

## *The Near East*

### EARTHQUAKE IN TURKEY

[Released to the press January 5]

Following is a translation of a message received from the President of the Turkish Republic in response to the message sent by President Roosevelt on December 28, 1939:<sup>2</sup>

"ANKARA, December 30, 1939.

"Deeply affected by the sentiments which Your Excellency was so kind as to express in your name and in the name of the Federal Government on the occasion of the earthquake which threw eastern Anatolia into mourning, I address to you my most sincere thanks.

ISMET INONU"

## *Commercial Policy*

### TRADE-AGREEMENT NEGOTIATIONS WITH ARGENTINA

[Released to the press January 5]

The reciprocal-trade-agreement negotiations between the United States and Argentina have broken down. An official statement will be issued by the two Governments early next week.

<sup>2</sup> See the *Bulletin* of December 30, 1939 (Vol. I, No. 27), p. 741.

## General

### OUTLOOK FOR THE COMING YEAR

#### Statement by the Secretary of State

[Released to the press January 1]

In response to numerous requests for an indication of his views as to the outlook for the coming year, the Secretary of State issued the following statement:

"It would be a rash man, indeed, who would undertake to forecast the course of international developments during the coming year. In the tangled skein of events in which the world is now enmeshed, clarity of thought and of vision is possible only to the extent that one clings tenaciously to basic ideas, which must remain true however they may be beclouded by the day-to-day situation.

"I do not know what the coming year will bring, but I am sure that there are in the world few men and women in whose hearts and minds there is not today a mingling of fear and apprehension and of hope.

"The fear and apprehension derive from the possibility that the black shadow of violent warfare, under which the world enters upon the year 1940, may grow blacker yet in the months to come. In the recent past, mankind has had a preview of the haunting picture of horror that is modern war. Along hundreds of miles of frontiers there now stand embattled, forces that may be unleashed at any moment and make a shambles of great civilized areas.

"The hope springs from the profound conviction, which is common to millions of men and women everywhere, that there is no inevitability about war. There is a way of peace for all nations, if they choose the way of peace rather than the way of war. But *all* nations must choose the way of peace. If any of the world's powerful nations decides to enter upon the road of armed conquest and determines to impose its will upon others by force of arms or threat of force, other nations find themselves

confronted with the tragic alternatives of surrender or armed defense.

"Hope is not dead today because, in the onward march of civilized man, the forces of freedom and progress in the end do triumph. In the grave crisis through which mankind is passing now, this may not happen until after a period of ruthless and unnecessary destruction of life and treasure. But the possibility is not excluded that, even during the coming year, *all* nations may find in themselves sufficient strength of conscience, of reason, of the very instinct of self-preservation to return—before the forces of destruction have been loosed in all their fury—to the tried and proven road of friendly and peaceful international relations, along which alone the human race can move in the direction of material advancement and spiritual progress.

"Whether, during the year 1940, the shadow which now overhangs the world deepens or whether it lightens and, perhaps, lifts altogether, the coming months will be, for our people, a period fraught with profound significance. If the warfare now in progress on other continents becomes intensified, its effects will fall more and more heavily upon us, as well as upon those directly engaged. If peace should come, we shall be confronted, in our own best interest, with the vital need of throwing the weight of our country's moral and material influence in the direction of creating a stable and enduring world order under law, lest the relations among nations again assume such a character as to make of them a breeding ground of economic conflict, social insecurity, and, again, war.

"It is a comforting thought that since the outbreak of hostilities in Europe, our people have shown a remarkable degree of unity in meeting

the vast complexity of problems thrust upon us by that catastrophe. Only thus can we keep strong within, insure the safety and security of our own Nation, and make our appropriate contribution toward helping the world as a whole to seek and find the road of peace and progress. Never before was there greater need in this

country for resoluteness of spirit, clear thinking, breadth of vision, and willingness to deal with the grave problems before us in the light of those basic and crucial considerations which affect the lives of each and every one of us today, and which will be decisive in shaping our Nation's future."

### *Traffic in Arms, Tin-Plate Scrap, etc.*

#### EXPORTATION OF TIN-PLATE SCRAP

[Released to the press January 5]

Allotments totaling 7,263 long tons of tin-plate scrap were assigned on December 29, 1939, to 35 producers of that commodity for export, subject to license, during the calendar year 1940, in accordance with the provisions of the rules of procedure prescribed by the Secretary of State on December 2, 1939.<sup>3</sup> Applications were received from 38 companies for allotments totaling 11,961 long tons. Three applicants failed to qualify for allotments because of failure to comply with the requirements set forth in the rules of procedure. Some of the other applications were necessarily reduced in order to comply with these requirements. Applications which conformed with those requirements were granted in full.

Applications for license to export tin-plate scrap during the calendar year 1940 may be submitted by any producer who has been assigned an allotment or by any person authorized by such producer to export tin-plate scrap under his allotment.

The attention of the producers to whom allotments have been assigned has been invited to paragraph (7) of the rules of procedure in which it is provided that licenses will not be issued during the first 6 months of the calendar year for the exportation of tin-plate scrap in quantities in excess of 50 percent of any allot-

ment of 50 long tons or more and to paragraph (9) thereof in which it is stated that the National Munitions Control Board may revoke, cancel, or modify at any time allotments or licenses and may modify the rules of procedure under which they have been issued whenever, in its opinion, such action is required in order to carry out the purposes of the act approved February 15, 1936.

Allotments totaling 13,636 long tons of tin-plate scrap were assigned for export, subject to license, during the calendar year 1939. One hundred seventy-two licenses were issued in 1939 authorizing the exportation of 10,699 long tons of tin-plate scrap valued at \$200,497.52. All licenses issued during 1939 named Japan as the country of destination.

### *Publications*

*Government publications of interest to readers of the "Bulletin":*

Address of the President of the United States Delivered Before a Joint Session of the Two Houses of Congress January 3, 1940, Third Session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, 1940. (H. Doc. 528, 76th Cong., 3d sess.) 6 pp. 5¢.

Twenty-third Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, 1939. (H. Doc. 503, 76th Cong., 2d sess.) vi, 57 pp. 10¢.

<sup>3</sup> See the *Bulletin* of December 9, 1939 (Vol. I, No. 24), pp. 677-679.

## Foreign Service of the United States

### PERSONNEL CHANGES

[Released to the press January 6]

#### *Changes in the Foreign Service of the United States since December 15, 1939:*

Bertel E. Kuniholm, of Gardner, Mass., second secretary of legation and consul at Riga, Latvia, has been assigned as consul at Zürich, Switzerland.

Joseph L. Brent, of Ruxton, Md., second secretary of embassy at Istanbul, Turkey, has been assigned as consul at Wellington, New Zealand.

Charles A. Bay, of St. Paul, Minn., consul at Seville, Spain, has been assigned as consul at México, D. F., Mexico.

Homer M. Byington, Jr., of Norwalk, Conn., second secretary of legation at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, has been assigned as consul at Belgrade and will serve in dual capacity.

Joseph C. Satterthwaite, of Tecumseh, Mich., second secretary of legation and consul at Baghdad, Iraq, has been designated second secretary of embassy at Istanbul, Turkey.

David C. Berger, of Gretna, Va., consul at Tientsin, China, has been assigned as consul at Shanghai, China.

John Peabody Palmer, of Seattle, Wash., vice consul at Saigon, French Indochina, has been assigned as vice consul at London, England.

George Bliss Lane, of St. James, Long Island, N. Y., consul at Wellington, New Zealand, has been designated third secretary of legation and consul at Baghdad, Iraq. Mr. Lane will serve in dual capacity.

Heyward G. Hill, of Hammond, La., consul at Zürich, Switzerland, has been designated second secretary of embassy and consul at Panamá, Panama. Mr. Hill will serve in dual capacity.

The following Foreign Service officers, vice consuls at their respective posts, have been assigned to the Foreign Service School, effective March 5, 1940:

Niles W. Bond, Lexington, Mass. . . .	Habana.
William O. Boswell, New Florence, Pa. . .	Havre.
Donald W. Brown, New York, N. Y. . .	Vienna.
Charles R. Burrows, Willard, Ohio . . .	Habana.
V. Lansing Collins, 2d, New York, N. Y. .	Marseille.
Arthur B. Emmons, 3d, Dover, Mass. . .	Montreal.
Nicholas Feld, Vicksburg, Miss. . . .	Zürich.
William N. Fraleigh, Summit, N. J. . . .	Naples.
Fulton Freeman, Pasadena, Calif. . . .	Mexico, D. F.
John C. Fuess, Andover, Mass. . . . .	Mexico, D. F.
Ogden H. Hammond, Jr., Bernardsville, N. J. . . . .	Leipzig.
Boles C. Hart, Jr., Mystic, Conn. . . .	Cologne.
Richard H. Hawkins, Jr., Pittsburgh, Pa. . . . .	Vancouver.
Martin J. Hillenbrand, Chicago, Ill. . .	Zürich.
Robert C. Strong, Beloit, Wis. . . . .	Prague.

The following have been appointed Foreign Service officers, unclassified; vice consuls of career; and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States; and they have been assigned vice consuls at their respective posts:

Wymberley DeR. Coerr, New Haven, Conn. . . . .	Montreal.
Adrian B. Colquitt, Savannah, Ga. . . .	Panamá.
Thomas J. Cory, Glendale, Calif. . . .	Vancouver.
Frederick J. Mann, Brooklyn, N. Y. . .	Toronto.
Julian L. Nugent, Jr., Pecos, N. Mex. .	Mexico, D. F.
Richard H. Post, Quoque, N. Y. . . . .	Windsor.
Charles H. Whitaker, Boston, Mass. . .	Habana.
Joseph Palmer, 2d, Belmont, Mass. . .	Mexico, D. F.

Carroll C. Parry, of St. Joseph, Mo., clerk at Prague, Bohemia, has been appointed vice consul at Prague, Bohemia.

Stanley T. Hayes, of New Hampshire, clerk at Montreal, Quebec, Canada, has been appointed vice consul at Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

The appointment of Thomas R. Flack, of Chicago, Ill., as vice consul at Frankfort on the Main, Germany, has been canceled. Mr. Flack will remain as vice consul at Vienna, Germany.

## ***Treaty Information***

*Compiled by the Treaty Division*

### **NAVIGATION**

#### **Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway Project**

On May 28, 1938, the Secretary of State addressed a note to the then Canadian Minister at Washington transmitting an informal and tentative draft of a proposed general treaty dealing with the utilization of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin.<sup>4</sup> On December 26, 1939, Mr. Loring Christie, the Canadian Minister at Washington, transmitted a proposal to the Secretary of State that a meeting be held in Ottawa between members of the public services of the two countries for informal discussions to clarify a number of questions of detail preliminary to a consideration of the broader questions of policy involved. This invitation has been accepted and the following officials will leave Washington on Saturday, January 6, to take part in the suggested discussions:

The Honorable ADOLF A. BERLE, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State

The Honorable LELAND OLDS, Chairman, Federal Power Commission

Mr. JOHN HICKERSON, Assistant Chief, Division of European Affairs, Department of State.

### **TELECOMMUNICATIONS**

#### **North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement**

##### *Mexico*

The American Ambassador to Mexico reported by a telegram dated December 29, 1939, that the Mexican Senate ratified on December 28, 1939, the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement signed at Habana on December 13, 1937.

<sup>4</sup> See *Treaty Information*, bulletin No. 105, June 1938, p. 177; also *Press Releases* of June 4, 1938 (Vol. XVIII, No. 453), pp. 621-634.

This agreement undertakes to establish in that region, which consists of Canada, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Mexico, Newfoundland, and the United States, and within the standard broadcast band, frequency assignments to specified classes of stations on clear, regional, and local channels with a view to avoiding interference which in this region has caused great inconvenience to radio listeners.

The agreement has been ratified by the United States of America, Canada, Cuba, and Haiti. Under the terms of article V, the agreement to be valid must be ratified by Canada, Cuba, Mexico, and the United States of America. The provisions for the ratification, execution, denunciation, effective date, and term of the agreement are contained in articles V and VI which are printed below:

#### **"V. RATIFICATION, EXECUTION, AND DENUNCIATION**

"1. *Ratification.*—To be valid this Agreement must be ratified by Canada, Cuba, Mexico and the United States of America.

"If and when three of said four countries shall have ratified and the fourth shall, through unavoidable circumstances, have been unable to ratify but shall have signified to those countries that have ratified, its readiness, pending ratification and as an administrative measure, to put the provisions of this Agreement (including the contents of Appendix I) into effect in whole or in part, then such country, together with those countries which shall have ratified, may, by administrative agreement between them, fix a definite date on which they shall give effect to such provisions, which date shall preferably be one year from the date of such administrative agreement.

"The ratifications must be deposited, as soon as possible, through diplomatic channels, in the archives of the Government of Cuba. This same Government shall, through diplomatic

channels, notify the other signatory Governments of the ratifications as soon as they are received.

"2. *Effect of ratification.*—This Agreement shall be valid only as between such countries as shall have ratified it.

"3. *Execution.*—The contracting Governments undertake to apply the provisions of this Agreement, and to take the steps necessary to enforce said provisions upon the private operating agencies recognized or authorized by them to establish and operate broadcast stations within their respective countries.

"4. *Denunciation.*—Each contracting Government shall have the right to denounce this Agreement by a notification addressed, through diplomatic channels, to the Government of Cuba, and announced by that Government, through diplomatic channels, to all the other contracting Governments. This denunciation shall take effect at the expiration of the period of one year from the date on which the notification was received by the Government of Cuba. This effect shall apply only to the author of the denunciation. This Agreement shall remain in force for the other contracting Governments but only as between such Governments.

#### "VI. EFFECTIVE DATE AND TERM OF THE AGREEMENT

"1. Except for the provisions of Section 1 of Part III, Section 1 of Part V, and paragraph 3 of Table VI of Appendix I annexed hereto (which provisions shall go into effect immediately upon this Agreement becoming valid), this Agreement shall become effective one year after the date it shall have been ratified by the fourth of those Governments whose ratification is requisite to the validity of this Agreement. The Governments will cooperate to the end that, wherever possible, the provisions of this Agreement shall be carried out in advance of said effective date.

"2. This Agreement shall remain in effect for a period of five years after said effective date."

Article VII provides that the agreement shall be open to adherence in the name of Newfoundland.

### HEALTH

#### Arrangement for the Establishment of the International Office of Public Health (Treaty Series No. 511)

##### *Hungary*

By a note dated December 30, 1939, the Italian Ambassador at Washington informed the Secretary of State that on November 17, 1939, the Hungarian Government gave notice to the Italian Government of its adherence to the Arrangement for the Establishment of the International Office of Public Health, signed at Rome on December 9, 1907.

According to the information of the Department of State the countries which have ratified and adhered to the arrangement are as follows: United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Belgium (including Belgian Congo), Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France (including French Protectorate of Morocco, Indochina, Madagascar, French Equatorial Africa, French West Indies, and Tunis), Great Britain (including Ceylon, Kenya, Nigeria, Straits Settlements, Federated Malay States, Gold Coast, Hong Kong, Sierra Leone, Tanganyika Territory, Uganda, Zanzibar, Palestine, and Sudan), Germany, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy (including Italian colonies), Japan, Luxemburg, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Spain (including Spanish Morocco), Rumania, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Syria and the Lebanon, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1940

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.—Price 10 cents - - - - - Subscription price, \$2.75 a year

PUBLISHED WEEKLY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET